DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 261 CS 501 209

AUTHOR Beekman, Susan J.
TITLE Sex Differences in Nonverbal Behavior.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (83rd, Chicago, August 30-September 3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Science Research; Behavior Patterns; Body Language; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Nonverbal Communication; Sex (Characteristics); *Sex Differences; Sex Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to evaluate the effects of both sex of subject and sex of partner with respect to a wide variety of nonverbal behaviors. The subjects were 44 men and 44 women graduate professional students at the University of Chicago. The behaviors were coded from videotapes of 88 dyadic conversations where each subject participated in one conversation with a stranger of the same sex and one conversation with a stranger of the opposite sex. A total of 54 behavioral variables were derived from the ratings and grouped into eight general categories: behaviors related to speaking turns, back channel behaviors, filled pauses, laughing and smiling behaviors, gazing behaviors, postural shifts, hand movement, and foot movement. It was concluded that sex of subject, but not sex of partner, had a significant effect on many of the nonverbal behaviors displayed during the conversations. Sex differences in the correlation between subjects' scores on the behavioral measures and their scores on several personality measures on a post-conversation questionnaire were used to generate hypotheses linking specific behavioral differences between the sexes to more general differences between interpersonal styles. (TS)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED116261

# SEX DIFFERENCES IN NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR[1]

Susan J. Beekman

Humboldt State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan J. Beekman

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

## Abstract

A variety of nonverbal behaviors was coded from videotapes of 88 dyadic conversations. The 44 male and 44 female subjects were paired so that each participated in one conversation with a stranger of the same sex and one conversation with a stranger of the opposite sex. It was found that sex of subject, but not sex of partner, had a significant effect on many of the nonverbal behaviors displayed during the conversations. Subjects' scores on the behavioral measures were correlated with their scores on several personality measures and on a post-conversation questionnaire. Sex differences in these correlations were used to generate hypotheses linking specific behavioral differences between the sexes to more general differences between the masculine and feminine interpersonal styles.

CS 501 209

[1]This study was supported in part by NSF grant GS-3033 awarded to Starkey Duncan, University of Chicago, by NSF grant GS-3127 awarded to Donald Fiske, University of Chicago, by a grant awarded to Starkey Duncan and Donald Fiske by the Social Science Divisional Research Committee of the University of Chicago, and by a University of Chicago Humanities Fellowship awarded to the author. The author is grateful to Starkey Duncan and Donald Fiske for the extensive assistance they provided with this study. The author also wishes to express her appreciation to Jeanine Carlson, George Niederehe, Bruno Repp, Thomas Shanks, and Cathy Stepanek, who assisted in coding the videotaped data and in the statistical analysis.

This paper is based on the author's doctoral dissertation (Beekman, 1973) which may be consulted for further details.

Sex Differences in Nonverbal Behavior

The issue of sex differences is a basic one for psychological research and one that is gaining increasing attention (Carlson & Carlson, 1960; Dan & Beekman, 1972; Harris, 1971; Sherman, 1971). Typical research contexts for the psychological study of sex differences have involved subjects interacting with test materials of one sort or another.

The typical study of nonverbal communication, however, requires the subject to interact with another person, either another subject or an experimental confederate. This procedure -- a natural one in the study of interpersonal processes -- inevitably introduces a complication to the study of sex differences. The sex of both the subject and the subject's partner are potentially relevant to the conduct of both participants in the interaction. Thus, there is a clear possibility that both subject sex and partner sex may be factors contributing to the experimental results obtained.

It seems fair to say that, on the whole, investigators of nonverbal behavior have been hesitant to expand their experimental designs so that the effects of both sex of subject and sex of partner can be simultaneously evaluated. The nonverbal behaviors of male and of female subjects have not been contrasted across same-sex and cross-sex interactions.

It also seems fair to say that, on the whole, investigators of nonverbal behavior have confined their attention to one or two behavioral variables in a given study. The consideration of a small number of behaviors is a virtual necessity when observations are made of live interactions. With the use of videotape recordings or motion-picture films

of interactions, it becomes possible to consider a larger number of behaviors in one study, with a corresponding gain in research efficiency.

The present study was designed to make possible a direct evaluation of the effects of both sex of subject and sex of partner with respect to a relatively wide variety of behaviors.

In addition to an interest in nonverbal behavior in dyadic interactions per se, a major motivation for the development of this study was an interest in issues related to contemporary sex roles. It was believed that a fine-grained analysis of characteristic nonverbal behaviors of men and women in same-sex and in cross-sex interactions could contribute to an understanding of masculine and feminine interpersonal styles and the variations in these styles associated with partner's sex.

## Method

The subjects were 88 graduate professional school students at the University of Chicago -- 22 men and 22 women from the Law School and another 22 men and 22 women from the School of Social Service Administration. They were recruited by means of a letter and a follow-up telephone call in which the project was described as "an exploratory study of human conversations." In return for their participation in an hour-and-a-half-long session, they were given $3.00.

Four subjects were scheduled for each data-gathering session. They were paired to form two conversational dyads and seated in two separate rooms in front of videotape cameras. A female experimenter gave the following instructions to each dyad: "I would like the two of you to have a conversation for the next seven minutes or so. You can use the time

to get acquainted with each other or to talk about anything else that interests you."

The experimental sessions were arranged so that each subject engaged in two seven-minute conversations -- one with a stranger of the same sex and one with a stranger of the opposite sex. The order of same-sex and cross-sex conversations was systematically varied from session to session.

Using the videotapes of these interactions, ratings were made of a variety of behaviors. All ratings involved either counting the frequency with which a particular behavior occurred or timing the duration of its display. Since subjects may have been unduly influenced by the strangeness of the situation at the beginning of each interaction, only the final five minutes of each seven-minute conversation were rated.

To evaluate reliability, a second rater made independent ratings of one subject in each of twenty videotaped conversations. Coefficients of intraclass correlation (Haggard, 1958) between the two sets of ratings were computed.

A total of 54 behavioral variables were derived from the ratings. These variables fall into eight general categories and are grouped in this manner below. After each variable, its inter-rater reliability coefficient is given in parentheses.

Behaviors Related to Speaking Turns

1. time subject spends talking (.99)
2. number of speaking turns subject takes (.96)
3. average duration of subject's speaking turns (.99)
4. duration of subject's longest speaking turn (.99)

5. number of times subject interrupts partner's speech (.87)
6. rate at which subject interrupts partner's speech (.89)
7. number of other-oriented questions subject asks (.98)

Back Channel Behaviors

8. number of times subject nods head during partner's speech (.90)
9. rate at which subject nods head during partner's speech (.95)
10. number of times subject gives one-word assents (e.g., "yes" or "mhm") during partner's speech (.87)
11. rate at which subject gives one-word assents during partner's speech (.90)
12. number of times subject gives longer assents (e.g., "That's right" or "I agree") during partner's speech (.91)
13. rate at which subject gives longer assents during partner's speech (.88)

Filled Pauses

14. number of filled pauses (the "ah's," "um's," and "er's" which sometimes occur during hesitations in speech) subject emits (.99)
15. rate at which subject emits filled pauses during speech (.97)

Laughing and Smiling Behaviors

16. rate at which subject laughs while speaking (.88)
17. rate at which subject laughs while not speaking (.96)
18. total number of times subject laughs (.94)
19. proportion of time subject spends smiling while speaking (.87)
20. proportion of time subject spends smiling while not speaking (.87)

21. total amount of time subject spends smiling (.94)
22. total number of times subject smiles (.92)

Gazing Behaviors

23. proportion of time subject spends gazing at partner while speaking (.93)
24. proportion of time subject spends gazing at partner while not speaking (.77)
25. total amount of time subject spends gazing at partner (.94)
26. total number of times subject gazes at partner (.92)
27. duration of longest gaze subject directs at partner (.91)
28. average duration of gazes subject directs at partner while speaking (.85)
29. average duration of gazes subject directs at partner while not speaking (.92)
30. average duration of all gazes subject directs at partner (.97)

Postural Shifts

31. rate at which subject shifts leg position while speaking (.91)
32. rate at which subject shifts leg position while not speaking (1.00)
33. total number of times subject shifts leg position (.96)
34. rate at which subject shifts seat position while speaking (1.00)
35. rate at which subject shifts seat position while not speaking (1.00)
36. total number of times subject shifts seat position (1.00)

Hand Movement

A number of researchers have pointed to the existence of two distinct types of hand movement (Duncan, 1972; Ekman & Friesen, 1969; Freedman, 1972; Rosenfeld, 1966). In this research, gestures are defined as hand movements which have a characteristic directionality, occur almost exclusively during speech, and appear to be closely linked to what is being said. Self-adaptors are defined as hand movements which involve some form of touching the body or clothing, occur during either speech or silence, and appear to be only indirectly related to what is being said.

37. time subject spends gesturing (.98)
38. proportion of time subject spends gesturing while speaking (.98)
39. number of times subject gestures (.99)
40. frequency with which subject gestures while speaking (.99)
41. average duration of subject's gestures (.99)
42. duration of subject's longest gesture (.97)
43. proportion of time during which subject engages in self-adaptors while speaking (.97)
44. proportion of time during which subject engages in self-adaptors while not speaking (.98)
45. total time during which subject engages in self-adaptors (.99)
46. total number of self-adaptors in which subject engages (.88)
47. duration of subject's longest self-adaptor (.95)
48. average duration of subject's self-adaptors while speaking (.82)
49. average duration of subject's self-adaptors while not speaking (.76)
50. average duration of all subject's self-adaptors (.86)

Foot Movement

51. total time subject spends moving feet (.99)

52. number of times subject moves feet (.98)

53. average duration of subject's foot movements (.93)

54. duration of subject's longest foot movement (.93)

Before participating in the experimental conversations, the subjects were seated in four separate rooms and asked to complete several paper-and-pencil measures of personality. After participating in the conversations, subjects were again seated in separate rooms and asked to fill out questionnaires about their experiences in the experimental situation.

The personality instruments used were the Adjective Check List (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965), the Inclusion scales from the FIRO-B questionnaire (Schutz, 1958), and the Thorndike Dimensions of Temperament scale (Thorndike, 1966). All three instruments utilize the self-descriptive mode of personality data collection (Fiske, 1971).

A total of 36 personality variables was derived from the three personality instruments. The post-conversation questionnaire yielded an additional seven variables.

## Results

Multivariate analysis of variance was applied to the behavioral data. The design of the experiment can be described as a 2x2x2x2 factorial design with repeated measures over the fourth factor. Factor A is the order in which the subject was paired with male and female partners. Factor B is the professional school in which the subject was enrolled. Factor C is the sex of the subject. Factor D, on which there are repeated measures, is the sex of the subject's partner.

All 54 behavioral measures were analyzed simultaneously using the multivariate procedure. The statistical procedure used to handle repeated measures is described in detail by Bock (1973).

Results of the analysis indicate that sex of subject had a significant effect on the behavioral variables (multivariate $F = 2.12$, $df = 54/27$, $p < .02$). Table 1 shows that 15 of the 54 behavioral variables had significant univariate F's for this effect. These findings will be discussed in the next section of this paper.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

None of the other factors, including sex of partner, had a significant main effect on the behavioral variables. Neither were any two-way interactions significant at the multivariate level of analysis.

Although the sex of subject x sex of partner interaction did not yield a significant multivariate F, it did yield one highly significant univariate F. It is probably safe to assume that this interaction had a real effect on number of talking turns. Table 2 presents the relevant statistics for this variable and for a highly related variable, average duration of talking turns.

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

One three-way interaction had a significant effect--sex of subject x sex of partner x order in which subject was paired with male and female partners (multivariate $F = 1.88$, $df = 54/27$, $p < .04$). Table 3 shows that the interaction of the latter two factors is equivalent to the effect

of a single factor--conversation number. Thus, this three-way interaction can be interpreted as a two-way interaction between sex of subject and conversation number. Differences in degree of familiarity with the experimental situation seemed to provoke characteristically different reactions in male and female subjects. Table 4 presents the eight variables which yielded significant univariate F's for this interaction effect.

---

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

---

As an aid in interpreting sex differences in behavior, product-moment correlations between scores on behavioral measures and scores on paper-and-pencil measures were computed separately for male and female subjects. In order to obtain the correlations involving personality variables, subjects' scores on these measures were correlated with their scores on the behavioral measures summed across the two conversations in which they participated. Each subject had two sets of scores on the questionnaire about experiences during the conversations--one set for each of the two conversations. Therefore, correlations involving questionnaire items were obtained by correlating subjects' scores on these items with their behavioral scores for the corresponding conversation.

With so many hundreds of correlations, it is quite likely that some are associated with sampling variation and would not be replicated in other data. Many of the larger correlations, however, fell into meaningful patterns or were consistent with other research findings. These were used to suggest interpretations linking sex differences found at the level of nonverbal behavior to more general differences between the masculine and feminine interpersonal styles.

## Interpretations and Discussion

The nonverbal behaviors found to vary with subject sex, or with subject sex in interaction with other factors, are discussed below. An attempt is made to relate the specific behavioral differences found between male and female subjects to more general differences between the sexes. Correlational relationships between behavioral variables and personality or experiential variables are reported where relevant.

### Length of Speaking Turns

In a dyadic conversation the two interactants must in general take turns speaking. Detailed analysis of the turn-taking mechanism (Duncan, 1972) has shown that the speaker emits a complex configuration of nonverbal cues which mark points in the conversation at which the auditor may appropriately claim the speaking turn.

In the present study, it was found that men tended to continue speaking for longer periods, on the average, than did women. When men conversed with each other, they tended to speak in even longer utterances than when they conversed with women. Because of their lengthy speaking turns, participants in male, same-sex dyads had time for fewer speaking turns than did participants in any other type of dyad.

The correlational data show that both male and female subjects who took long speaking turns tended to describe themselves in more aggressive terms on the personality measures than subjects who took shorter turns. For men, scores on average duration of talking turns correlated with Adjective Check List scores for Autonomy (.36), Aggression (.34), Deference (-.34), Nurturance (-.34), and Affiliation (-.30). For women, average duration of talking turns correlated with the Adjective Check List score for Aggression (.31).

Kendon and Cook (1969) found that subjects who spoke in lengthy, infrequent utterances in dyadic conversations tended to be perceived as more powerful by their conversational partners. Perhaps claiming long blocks of conversation time is a way of asserting oneself as a potent force in an interaction.

A number of investigators have described the traditional masculine interpersonal style as aggressive, assertive, and oriented towards personal achievement, while the traditional feminine interpersonal style is described as affiliative, accomodative, and oriented towards the maintenance of harmonious social relationships (Anastasi, 1958; Bennett & Cohen, 1958; Tyler, 1965). If taking long speaking turns is related to an assertion of potency, it is not surprising that men take longer turns, on the average, than women. Nor is it surprising that men take the longest turns, on the average, in same-sex interactions where the relative dominance of interactants is not settled a priori by adherence to traditional sex roles.

Filled Pauses

Male subjects tended to emit many more "ah's," "um's," "er's," and the like in the course of speaking than did female subjects. This sex difference was very highly significant.

A great deal of research has been done on filled pauses and related hesitation phenomena. Previous studies have discovered positive relationships between the emission of many filled pauses and emotional arousal (Boomer, 1963; Panek & Martin, 1959), less productive speech and thought (Duncan, 1965; Goldman-Eisler, 1961; Livant, 1963), and an exaggerated degree of self-monitoring during speech (Boomer & Dittman, 1964).

These findings are helpful in understanding the correlations involving filled pauses which were found in this research. For male subjects, rate of filled pauses during speech correlated with the Adjective Check List variables Counseling Readiness (.46), Abasement (.31), Heterosexuality (-.45), Dominance (-.34), and with the Thorndike variables Sociable (-.48) and Ascendant (-.32).

In an unfamiliar, mildly stressful social situation, it is likely that men who described themselves in such negative terms experienced a greater degree of emotional disturbance and engaged in more self-monitoring and cognitive blocking than other men.

A similar correlational pattern was not found for female subjects. No woman emitted a very large number of filled pauses, and no strong correlations involving the filled pause variables were found.

It is possible that male subjects experienced more normative pressure to assert themselves by speaking in fairly lengthy utterances than did female subjects. One function which has been proposed for filled pauses is that of retaining the speaker's speaking turn in a conversation while he is searching for words (Maclay & Osgood, 1959). A man who is having trouble finding words because of anxiety and self-monitoring may emit many filled pauses in order to hold the floor in the conversation. A woman might be more likely simply to end her speaking turn when words do not flow freely.

Smiling and Laughing

Female subjects tended to smile and laugh more than male subjects. Scores on all seven variables in this category varied significantly with sex of subject. The magnitude of the sex difference decreased between

the first and second conversations for the three variables on which the sex of subject x conversation number interaction showed a significant effect, but the direction of the difference was not reversed.

Striking sex differences appeared in the correlational data involving smiling and laughing variables. The male subjects who laughed and smiled most tended to describe themselves as more sociable, friendly, and affiliative than men who engaged in less smiling and laughing. For men, total number of smiles correlated with the Thorndike variable Sociable (.51), with the FIRO variables Inclusion Wanted (.43) and Inclusion Expressed (.41), and with the Adjective Check List variables Affiliation (.39) and Nurturance (.34). Total number of laughs correlated with the Thorndike variable Sociable (.39) and with the FIRO variable Inclusion Wanted (.35).

In contrast, the female subjects who laughed and smiled most tended to describe themselves as more uncomfortable in the experimental situation and as generally more retiring and deferent than women who laughed and smiled less. For women, total number of smiles correlated with the questionnaire variable Comfort with Camera (-.32), with the Adjective Check List variables Deference (.37) and Abasement (.34), and with the Thorndike variable Tough-minded (-.39). Total number of laughs correlated with the questionnaire variable Comfort with Camera (-.33) and with the Thorndike variable Ascendant (-.39).

Since the traditional feminine role calls for affiliative, sociable behavior, women may tend to engage in smiling and laughing more to meet social expectations than to express genuine friendliness and warmth. Bugental, Love, & Gianetto (1971) used a similar hypothesis to account

for their finding that fathers' smiles tended to be accompanied by friendly, approving statements to their children, whereas mothers' smiles were not related to positive verbalizations.

Female subjects who felt uncomfortable in the experimental situation or who saw themselves in deferent, self-abasing terms may have perceived smiling and laughing as safe, acceptable behaviors which would help them win favor in a threatening environment. The finding that women's scores on several smiling and laughing measures tended to be lower for second conversations than for first fits this interpretation. Presumably, subjects were more familiar with the experimental situation and more comfortable in it during the second conversation. They could then relax and exhibit fewer socially ingratiating behaviors.

Men are not expected to behave in as friendly, affiliative a fashion as women. Indeed, too much affiliative behavior may run counter to masculine role prescriptions. Men's scores on several smiling and laughing measures tended to be higher for second conversations, when subjects may have been less worried about meeting social expectations. The male subjects who engaged in much smiling and laughing did not do so in order to appear properly masculine, but in order to express genuinely affiliative tendencies.

Gazing at Partner

Sex differences in the use of gazing were first noted by Exline (1963) and have been confirmed by a number of subsequent studies (Exline & Winters, 1965; Exline, Gray, & Schuette, 1965; Argyle & Dean, 1965; Libby, 1970). This research corroborates all previous work in finding

that women spend more time gazing at their conversational partners than do men.

People generally spend much more time gazing at their partners while listening to them than while speaking (Exline & Winters, 1965; Kendon, 1967). Somewhat different functions have been suggested for gazing while listening (Argyle & Kendon, 1967) and gazing while speaking (Efran & Broughton, 1966; Exline & Messick, 1967; Kendon, 1967). In the correlational data generated by this research, there was no overlap between the personality variables which correlated with gazing while listening and those which correlated with gazing while speaking. Clear sex differences appeared in the former set of correlations, but not in the latter.

For male subjects, but not for female subjects, the proportion of time spent gazing while listening correlated positively with personality variables indicating friendliness and sociability. For men, proportion of time gazing at partner while listening correlated with the Thorndike variables Sociable (.35) and Cheerful (.30) and with the FIRO variable Inclusion Expressed (.34). For women, proportion of time gazing while listening did not correlate with any variable related to affiliativeness.

Other research suggests that gazing while listening indicates attentiveness to what is being said and makes the speaker feel powerful and valued (Argyle & Kendon, 1967). Perhaps, like smiling and laughing, gazing at one's partner while listening is an affiliative behavior which, as such, is required by the feminine role. Women may, therefore, engage in it to meet social expectations rather than to express genuine interest in the other.

For both men and women, the proportion of time spent gazing at partner while speaking correlated positively with personality variables indicating high self-control and low spontaneity. For men, proportion of time gazing at partner while speaking correlated with the Thorndike variable Placid (.37) and with the Adjective Check List variable Order (.34). For women, scores on this behavioral variable were correlated with scores on the Thorndike variable Responsible (.39) and the Adjective Check List variable Exhibition (-.31).

Persons with high self-control and low spontaneity may be more inclined to seek visual feedback from their partners while formulating their speech than a more spontaneous person would. The finding that women, as a group, did more gazing while speaking than men, as a group, may indicate that women's speech productions tend to be guided more by partners' responses and less by their own impulses than are men's speech productions.

Postural Shifts

Male subjects made significantly more seat position shifts and leg position shifts during the experimental sessions than did female subjects. In addition, sex of subject interacted with conversation number to produce a significant effect on number of seat position shifts.

It is difficult to interpret these findings in a fully satisfactory manner. Very little research on postural shifts has been done, and the correlational data generated in this study fell into no clear patterns.

Two hypotheses are suggested to account for the sex differences found. The first states that postural shifting during a conversation signals restlessness, whereas remaining motionless is a sign of attentiveness.

Women exhibit fewer postural shifts than men because the feminine role calls for more other-oriented behavior.

The second hypothesis relates sex differences in frequency of postural shifts to sex differences in dress. The number of positions which a person wearing a skirt can assume with propriety is probably much smaller than the number of positions a person wearing pants can assume. Maintaining propriety while shifting from one position to another may also be more difficult for the skirt-clad individual. Thus, for women, training in propriety may mean training in immobility.

Hand Movement

Only one of the fourteen variables in this category showed any significant relation to subject sex. This variable was duration of the longest gesture exhibited by a subject. Duration of the longest gesture tended to decrease between first and second conversations for male subjects, while it tended to increase for female subjects. Factors which may account for this finding are considered below in the discussion of a similar finding involving several foot movement variables.

Foot Movement

Scores on three of the four foot movement variables showed a significant sex of subject x conversation number interaction effect. These variables were time spent moving feet, average duration of foot movements, and duration of longest foot movement. Mean scores decreased between first and second conversations for male subjects, while they increased for female subjects.

The same changes between first and second conversations were found on two other body movement variables -- number of seat position shifts

and duration of longest gesture. Perhaps being in the strange experimental situation in front of a videotape camera for the first time tended to increase the overall level of body activity of male subjects while it inhibited that of female subjects. Bodily activity may have been a socially appropriate way for men to express nervousness and tension. Women, however, may have felt a greater need to maintain proper, ladylike immobility when they felt themselves on display in an unfamiliar situation.

Both male and female subjects probably felt somewhat more comfortable and relaxed during the second conversation. For men, greater comfort may have been straightforwardly reflected in reduced body activity. When women became more comfortable, in contrast, they may have felt freer to deviate from the standard of ladylike behavior and, therefore, freer to discharge accrued nervous energy through body activity.

## Summary and Conclusions

The design of the study permitted analysis of the effects of both subject sex and partner sex upon the mean use of a relatively large number of nonverbal variables. The results indicate (a) that men and women significantly differ in their use of certain nonverbal modalities and (b) that men and women do not significantly vary the extent to which they use most of these nonverbal behaviors between same-sex and cross-sex interactions.

Two major limitations on the generalizability of these findings must be kept in mind. The first arises from the rather atypical population from which the subjects were drawn (graduate professional school students), and the second arises from the unusual nature of the experimental situation (conversations in the presence of videotape cameras). It is

especially important to remember the second limitation when evaluating the negative finding regarding effect of partner's sex. The presence of unusual situational factors may have had such an important impact upon nonverbal behavior that other situational factors, such as partner's sex, became less salient than they usually are.

In addition to sex differences in nonverbal behavior itself, sex differences in the patterns of correlation between scores on behavioral measures and scores on written measures were found. These were used to generate hypotheses linking specific behavioral differences between the sexes to more general differences between the masculine and feminine roles.

Some of the behavioral differences found between male and female subjects could be interpreted as sex differences in the display of affiliative and sociable behaviors. Female subjects did more smiling and laughing and paid more visual attention to their partners than did male subjects. Sex differences in patterns of correlation between scores on these behavioral measures and scores on self-descriptive measures suggest that female subjects engaged in large amounts of smiling, laughing and gazing at their partners in order to fulfill traditional feminine role prescriptions. The male subjects who engaged in large amounts of these behaviors, in contrast, seem to have done so in order to express individual tendencies toward affiliative behavior.

Another set of behavioral differences seemed related to sex differences in assertive behaviors. Both correlational data from this study and the findings of other research suggest that claiming long blocks of conversation time is a way of asserting oneself as a potent force in

an interaction. During the experimental conversations, male subjects tended to take longer talking turns, on the average, than female subjects and also to use more filled pauses, perhaps to hold their turns while searching for words.

Still other behavioral differences found between male and female subjects seem to relate to sex differences in permissible activity levels. Men tended to receive higher scores on a number of body movement variables during the first conversation than during the second one, whereas the reverse was true for women. Bodily activity may be a socially appropriate way for men to express their nervousness in unfamiliar situations. Women, on the other hand, may tend to maintain ladylike immobility when they feel most uncomfortable and to exhibit more bodily activity later when they feel more relaxed.

This study's findings indicate clearly that researchers in the field of nonverbal communication cannot afford to ignore subject sex as a variable. Some of the sex differences found in this research, such as those involving amount of time spent gazing at partner, have already been widely reported. In many areas, however, the effect of subject sex has not previously been investigated. Although a great deal of research has been done on filled pauses, for example, reports of this work do not indicate that any previous investigators checked for sex differences.

In this research, sex of partner did not have a significant effect on most of the nonverbal behavior displayed in dyadic interactions. It is probably unwise to generalize this conclusion much beyond the variables studied or beyond the particular experimental situation to which it

pertains. In other situations, or with other behavioral variables, partner's sex might become a very salient factor, which the researcher could not safely ignore.

Table 1

Variables Which Show Significant Sex of Subject Effect

| Variables | Mean for males | Mean for females | Univariate F | P less than |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Larger mean scores for males | | | | |
| Average duration of talk turns[a] | 14.72 | 11.22 | 6.49 | .013 |
| Number of filled pauses | 12.09 | 4.61 | 20.23 | .001 |
| Rate of filled pauses[b] | .08 | .03 | 27.09 | .001 |
| Number of seat position shifts | .83 | .46 | 5.79 | .019 |
| Number of leg position shifts | 1.52 | .94 | 4.92 | .030 |
| Larger mean scores for females | | | | |
| Rate of laughs while speaking[b] | .01 | .02 | 12.03 | .001 |
| Rate of laughs while not speaking[b] | .008 | .012 | 5.35 | .024 |
| Total number of laughs | 2.80 | 4.74 | 12.90 | .001 |
| Proportion of time smiling while not speaking | .09 | .14 | 10.71 | .002 |
| Total time smiling[a] | 28.39 | 42.16 | 5.85 | .018 |
| Total number of smiles | 7.27 | 9.64 | 8.11 | .006 |

Table 1 (Continued)

| Variables | Mean for males | Mean for females | Univariate *F* | *P* less than |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Larger mean scores for females (Continued) | | | | |
| Proportion of time gazing at partner while speaking | .56 | .66 | 9.84 | .003 |
| Proportion of time gazing at partner while not speaking | .84 | .90 | 5.68 | .020 |
| Total time gazing at partner[a] | 207.24 | 228.88 | 7.74 | .007 |

[a]Time in seconds.

[b]Rate per second.

Table 2

Variables on Which the Sex of Subject X

Sex of Partner Effect Approaches Significance

| Variables | Sex of Partner | Mean for males | Mean for females | Univariate F | P less than |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of talk turns | Male | 10.66 | 14.30 | 9.07 | .004 |
| | Female | 14.32 | 14.32 | | |
| Average duration of talk turns[a] | Male | 16.64 | 11.02 | 3.93 | .051 |
| | Female | 12.80 | 11.42 | | |

[a]Time in seconds.

Table 3

Reduction of the Sex of Partner x Order of Pairing Interaction to a Single Factor: Conversation Number

| Sex of Partner | Order of Pairing | |
|---|---|---|
| | Male Partner 1st, Female Partner 2nd | Female Partner 1st, Male Partner 2nd |
| Male | 1st Conversation | 2nd Conversation |
| Female | 2nd Conversation | 1st Conversation |

Table 4

Variables Which Show Significant

Sex of Subject x Conversation Number Effect

| Variables | Conversation number | Mean for males | Mean for females | Univariate F | P less than |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rate of laughs while not speaking[a] | 1 | .0058 | .0128 | 4.07 | .048 |
| | 2 | .0095 | .0110 | | |
| Proportion of time smiling while speaking | 1 | .0935 | .1553 | 9.57 | .003 |
| | 2 | .1254 | .1324 | | |
| Total time smiling[b] | 1 | 24.31 | 43.93 | 6.81 | .011 |
| | 2 | 32.41 | 40.39 | | |
| Number of seat position shifts | 1 | 1.068 | .432 | 5.12 | .027 |
| | 2 | .591 | .477 | | |
| Time spent moving feet[b] | 1 | 75.81 | 57.13 | 9.85 | .003 |
| | 2 | 58.63 | 72.13 | | |
| Average duration of foot movements[b] | 1 | 2.813 | 2.370 | 7.38 | .009 |
| | 2 | 2.412 | 3.585 | | |
| Duration of longest foot movement[b] | 1 | 10.93 | 9.57 | 5.15 | .026 |
| | 2 | 8.48 | 14.39 | | |
| Duration of longest gesture[b] | 1 | 10.50 | 9.34 | 5.28 | .025 |
| | 2 | 8.43 | 11.64 | | |

[a]Rate per second.

[b]Time in seconds.

References

Anastasi, A. Differential psychology: Individual and group differences in behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1958.

Argyle, M., & Dean, J. Eye contact, distance, and affiliation. Sociometry, 1965, 28, 289-304.

Argyle, M., & Kendon, A. The experimental analysis of social performance. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. 3. New York: Academic Press, 1967.

Beekman, S. J. Nonverbal behaviors in dyadic conversations in relation to subject sex and partner sex. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1973.

Bennett, E. M., & Cohen, L. R. Men and women: Personality patterns and contrasts. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1959, 59, 101-155.

Bock, R. D. Multivariate statistical methods in behavioral research. Unpublished manuscript, University of Chicago, 1973.

Boomer, D. S. Speech disturbance and body movement in interviews. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease. 1963, 136, 263-266.

Boomer, D. S., & Dittmann. A. T. Speech rate, filled pause and body movement in interviews. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1964, 139, 324-327.

Bugental, D. E., Love, L. R., & Gianetto, R. M. Perfidious feminine faces. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17, 314-318.

Carlson, E., & Carlson, R. Male and female subjects in personality research. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 482-483.

Dan, A., & Beekman, S. Male versus female representation in psychological research. American Psychologist, 1972, 27, 1078.

Duncan, S. D., Jr. Paralinguistic behaviors in client-therapist communication in psychotherapy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965.

Duncan, S. D., Jr. Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 23, 283-292.

Efran, J. S., & Broughton, A. Effect of expectancies for social approval on visual behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 103-107.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, usage, and coding. Semiotica, 1969, 1, 49-98.

Exline, R. V. Explorations in the process of person perception: Visual interaction in relation to competition, sex, and need for affiliation. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 1-20.

Exline, R., Gray, D., & Schuette, D. Visual behavior in a dyad as affected by interview content and sex of respondent. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 201-209.

Exline, R. V., & Messick, D. The effects of dependency and social reinforcement upon visual behavior during an interview. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1967, 6, 256-266.

Exline, R. V., & Winter, L. C. Affective relations and mutual glances in dyads. In S. S. Tomkins & C. E. Izard (Eds.), Affect, cognition, and personality. New York: Springer, 1965.

Fiske, D. W. Measuring the concepts of personality. Chicago: Adline, 1971.

Freedman, N. An analysis of movement behavior during the clinical interview. In A. W. Siegman & B. Pope (Eds.), Studies in Dyadic communication. New York: Pergamon Press, 1972.

Goldman-Eisler, F. A comparative study of two hesitation phenomena. Language and Speech, 1961, 4, 18-26.

Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. The adjective check list manual. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1965.

Haggard, E. A. Intraclass correlation and the analysis of variance. New York: Dryden Press, 1958.

Harris, S. J. Influence of subject and experimenter sex in psychological research. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 291-294.

Kendon, A. Some functions of gaze-direction in social interaction. Acta Psychologica, 1967, 26, 22-63.

Kendon, A. & Cook, M. The consistency of gaze patterns in social interaction. British Journal of Psychology, 1969, 60, 481-494.

Libby, W. L., Jr. Eye contact and direction of looking as stable individual differences. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1970, 4, 303-312.

Livant, W. P. Antagonistic functions of verbal pauses: Filled and unfilled pauses in the solution of additions. Language and Speech, 1963, 6, 1-4.

Maclay, H., & Osgood, C. E. Hesitation phenomena in spontaneous English speech. Word, 1959, 19, 19-44.

Panek, D. M., & Martin, B. The relationship between GSR and speech disturbances in psychotherapy. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 402-405.

Rosenfeld, H. M. Instrumental affiliative functions of facial and gestural expressions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 65-72.

Schutz, W. C. FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Rinehart, 1958.

Sherman, J. A. On the psychology of women: A survey of empirical studies. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.

Thorndike, R. L. Thorndike Dimensions of Temperament manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1966.

Tyler, L. E. The psychology of human differences. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.